



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/399,753	09/21/1999	CRAIG MILLER	00479.83892	2665

7590 09/27/2002

BANNER & WITCOFF
ELEVENTH FLOOR
1001 G STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 200014597

EXAMINER

KYLE, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/399,753

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles R Kyle

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,6 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "to the advertisement" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-15, 18-19 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig et al.*

With respect to Claim 14, *Ludwig* discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including in a method of creating a user-defined network environment without requiring administrator privileges (Fig. 1; Col. 5, line 65 to Col. 6, line 64), the steps of:

1) creating a group by specifying a plurality of group members entitled to use the user-defined network environment (Figs. 2A and 8B; Col. 24, lines 16 to Col. 26, line 26);

Art Unit: 3624

2) selecting a plurality of web-based (Fig. 2B, “”Posle Browser” element) tools from a list of available tools, wherein the selected tools are to be made available to the plurality of group members specified in step 1 (Figs. 20, 30; Summary of the Invention; Col. 18, lines 39-45);

3) through the use of computer software (Summary of the Invention) automatically creating the user-defined networked environment by creating a web page (Fig. 2B, “”Posle Browser” element) accessible to the plurality of group members selected in step 1, wherein the web page provides access to the plurality of tools selected in step 2 (Col. 19, line 49 to Col. 20, line 4; Fig.. 8A).

Ludwig does not specifically disclose a group identifier and description. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided such information to users because this would have allowed a user to locate and confirm identity of groups in which he or she might wish to participate.

With respect to Claim 15, *Ludwig* discloses inviting prospective group members at Col. 22, lines 26-38.

Concerning Claim 18, *Ludwig* discloses electronic collaboration among group members Abstract.

With respect to Claim 19, *Ludwig* discloses destroying the environment at Col. 23, lines 31-50.

With respect to Claim 25, *Ludwig* discloses brainstorming in the environment at Col. 1, lines 39-45.

Art Unit: 3624

With respect to Claim 26, it is the system form of Claim 14 and recites the same functionality. *Ludwig* further discloses a plurality of computers networked (Fig. 1), a plurality of web browsers (Fig. 2B), and a database that stores information concerning the user-defined network environment (Col. 8, lines 27-40). *Ludwig* does not specifically disclose that the computers are networked through the Internet, although a WAN is shown in Fig. 1. The WAN is clearly indicated to be the Internet, however, because of the provision of web-based browsers as noted above. Such web-based browsers inherently function on the Internet.

Claims 16-17, 27-31 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig et al* in view of *Walker et al*.

With respect to Claim 16, *Walker* discloses advertisement for prospective participants at Col. 2, lines 1-19.

With respect to Claim 17, it would have been obvious to screen for participants because this would have limited the environment to suitable persons. An example of such screening is performing a credit check of potential purchasers.

With respect to Claim 27, *Ludwig* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of Claim 14 above. *Ludwig* does not specifically disclose steps 4- 8 as set forth in Claim 27. *Walker* discloses these steps as posting offers to form a contract (Fig. 5A), posting responses (Fig. 5C; Col. 4, line 62 to Col. 5, line 7), researching responses (Col. 9., line 38 to Vol. 10, line 26), negotiating to accept a response (Fig. 5E; Abstract) and electronically signing the contract (Col. 12, lines 34-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected the negotiation method steps disclosed by

Art Unit: 3624

Walker in the method of *Ludwig* because this would have facilitated the haggling type negotiation disclosed by *Walker*.

Concerning Claim 28, *Walker* suggests a user-selected sort order at Figs. 5a-5e. Providing such a capability would allow users to more effectively search for items they wanted. This is as opposed to endless scrolling through unordered items.

Concerning Claims 29-31, see the discussion of Claim 27 above and anonymous negotiation was well known at the time of the invention and allowed negotiators to transact business without allowing the opposing negotiator the advantage of knowing his/her personal characteristics and weaknesses. Simultaneous revelation of identity would allow both parties to obtain this benefit.

With respect to Claims 33 and 34, see the discussion of Claim 16 and the use of hyperlinks was old and well known at the time of the invention.

With respect to Claim 35, *Ludwig* discloses these steps which constitute negotiation at Col. 1, lines 25-50.

With respect to Claim 36, see the discussions of Claims 27 and 17 above.

With respect to Claim 37, *Walker* discloses use of the Internet at Col. 7, line 47 to Col. 8, line 57.

Concerning Claim 38, *Ludwig* discloses collaboration, communication and transaction tools at the Background of the Invention.

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig et al* in view of *Ferguson*.

With respect to Claim 20, *Ludwig* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of Claim 14 above. *Ludwig* does not specifically disclose using its invention for an auction. *Ferguson* discloses use of networked collaboration for auctions at Col. 8, lines 55-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have implemented the auction of *Ferguson* in the networked environment of *Ludwig* because this would have allowed for the interpersonal communications described by *Ludwig* which would have made the auction of *Ferguson* more exciting. Additionally, *Ludwig* discloses using their invention for business negotiations, of which auctions are a type. See Background of the Invention.

With respect to Claim 21, a survey would have been obvious for the same interpersonal communication benefit cited directly above. Such interpersonal communication would allow a person doing a survey to obtain much more “feedback” than as with simple forms filling.

With respect to Claim 22, *Ferguson* discloses bid and proposal format at Col. 8, lines 55-61.

With respect to Claim 23, an auction is read as ordering goods and services. See the discussion of Claim 20 above.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig et al* in view of *Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, Third Edition*.

With respect to Claim 24, *Ludwig* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of Claim 14 above. *Ludwig* does not specifically disclose use of EDI to execute business transactions. *Dictionary* discloses the use of EDI for business transactions at page 169.

Art Unit: 3624

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used EDI for executing commercial transactions because it provides standardized business documents, which would have facilitated the completion of transactions.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig et al* and *Walker* and further in view of *Axaopoulus et al*.

Ludwig and *Walker* disclose the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of Claim 27 above. They do not disclose the use of a keyword search agent. *Axaopoulus* discloses this feature at Col. 15, lines 36-40 at least. The combination would have been obvious because this would have simplified search efforts by users of the electronic commerce environment of *Axaopoulus*.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kyle whose telephone number is (703) 305-4458. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7687

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/399,753

Page 8

Art Unit: 3624

crk

crk

September 24, 2002


VINCENT MILLIN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600